

Religious extremists who murder the innocent? Or all of the above? If this is a true and accurate representation of the majority's position, it is not surprising that Congress has not sent an emergency supplemental to the President.

I serve on the Armed Services Committee. I have traveled several times to Iraq. I have visited, numerous times, Walter Reed Hospital and the military hospital in Germany. I have to say that I have not talked to one GI who says the war is lost. I have not talked to one injured soldier who says the war is lost. I have not talked to one officer who has said the war is lost. I have not talked to one commander who has said the war is lost. The only place I hear the statement that the war is lost is right here from the Halls of our Nation's Capitol or from news reports from Al-Jazeera or Iranian television quoting the majority leader of the Senate.

Our American soldiers believe they can win. Our American soldiers always believe they can win. That is why they are American soldiers. They are the best. It has to be very disturbing to our American soldiers to constantly hear politicians in Washington, DC, telling them they can't win. The Democratic leadership in Washington is playing a game of roulette with the administration where the only losers will be the American soldier.

We need to focus on providing our troops the equipment and resources they need to win this war. It is a global war. We have to quit acting as if short-term political gains are going to win this war for us. They will not. We need a unified and serious effort on the part of both parties in the Congress to win this war and to keep our Nation secure. History is going to judge us based on how we respond to the crisis of our generation.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, instead of this body appointing an accusatory finger across the partisan aisle, what this body ought to be doing is invoking the old principle that in the old days, at the water's edge, partisanship stops. We have seen on both sides of the aisle too much of that partisanship, particularly in matters of war and peace. There is a genuine disagreement not only over the conduct of the war but the very fact that we are in this war to begin with. We can't do anything about that now. We were given false information, massaged information, misinformation that caused us to enter this war and, after a quick and very decisive and very impressive victory, then set about the process of an occupation that was fraught with error and misinformation. But that was then, and now is now. What is in the interest of the United States? Clearly it is to stabilize Iraq, if that is possible.

A distinguished group of Americans, five Republicans and five Democrats in

the Iraq study commission, unanimously came together last winter and said what they thought would be the plan, the best way we could stabilize Iraq, led by an eminent and distinguished Republican, former Secretary of State and a former Chief of Staff in the White House to President Reagan, Jim Baker, and led by the longtime and distinguished and equally as respected former Congressman and former chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee in the House, Lee Hamilton.

Now, this is not a question about losing or winning a war; this is a question about, What is the best chance we have for stabilizing Iraq? Because clearly a stabilized Iraq in that part of the world is going to certainly help the neighbors in the region, and it is certainly going to help us, and clearly it is going to help the Iraqis.

So what did the Iraq study commission say? Well, they said it very clearly. I am reading from the Executive Summary:

The primary mission of U.S. forces in Iraq should evolve to one of supporting the Iraqi army, which would take over primary responsibility for combat operations. By the first quarter of 2008—

By the way, that is a year from now, that is April, that is the end of March—

By the first quarter of 2008, subject to unexpected developments in the security situation on the ground, all combat brigades not necessary for force protection could be out of Iraq.

It is true, they did not say "should be out of Iraq." They said "could be out of Iraq." But they are giving a blueprint.

I continue with the quote:

At that time, U.S. combat forces in Iraq could be deployed only in units embedded with Iraqi forces, in rapid-reaction and special operations teams, and in training, equipping, advising, force protection, and search and rescue.

I conclude this particular paragraph:

Intelligence and support efforts would continue. A vital mission of those rapid reaction and special operations forces would be to undertake strikes against al Qaeda in Iraq.

That is the Iraq Study Group report. It said: Go after al-Qaida. It said: Continue to train the Iraqi forces. It specifically talked about, in that training, embedding with Iraqi forces. It said "force protection," meaning force protection for our forces and for U.S. personnel. And it said "search and rescue" missions. That is exactly what we have in front of us today to vote on.

Now, there is additional language put in here about the President would have to certify and waive on this and that progress by the Iraqi Government. Clearly, you want to give some indicators to the Iraqi Government of what we expect. Again, what we are voting on today is a goal of having redeployed—basically, with the waiver by the President, we are talking about October 1. This is April—May, June, July, August, September—6 months from now is the goal of starting the rede-

ployment. It does not say "withdrawal," it says "redeployment" because "redeployment" is a term that is then defined by all of those things we just talked about. That is in this legislation we are going to vote on today.

Now, there are those in this body I certainly respect who would say they do not want any kind of conditions put on the President in order to conduct the war. I respect that. That is a difference of opinion that we have. But common sense would tell you that you cannot conduct a war if you do not have the support of the American people. The American people clearly want change. So it is time for us to start the process of the change.

Now, this Senator, along with most every Senator in this Senate, was in the meeting yesterday with General Petraeus. There was clearly a message that General Petraeus had hope, but seasoned with a great deal of reality, realizing the additional complexity. There were no clear-cut answers yesterday in us meeting with the top general over there in Iraq, a general whom we all admire and respect. Yes, there is still hope. But there is also the need for change. This document starts the process of the change.

Now, it is my hope that after we go through this exercise, it will pass today—narrowly, just like it passed a month ago narrowly—the legislation will go down to the President—and he has already said he is going to veto it—and then is the opportunity for cooler heads, as the Good Book says, to come let us reason together. That is my hope.

So I will be voting for this supplemental funding request that funds the troops, that funds other necessary emergencies.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada.

IRAQ

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the subject of the emergency war supplemental and the adverse impact this political theater is having on our efforts in Iraq.

For me, this political gamesmanship calls to mind a book written some 50 years ago about some very brave men in our Nation's history—not brave in the sense of today's marines and soldiers, who are doing the grunt work in Afghanistan and Iraq to ensure that the free world can sleep in peace at night. No, the men in this book were brave for a very different reason.

The book I am referring to is the 1956 classic, "Profiles in Courage," written by a young U.S. Senator from Massachusetts, John F. Kennedy, who later became our 35th President. The book is an account of men of principle, integrity, and bravery in American politics.

Then-Senator Kennedy profiled eight exceptional U.S. Senators from throughout the Senate's history whom he considered to be models of virtue

and courage under pressure. These men defied the public opinion of the day in order to do what was right for the country even though they suffered severe criticism and losses in popularity because of these actions.

The Senators profiled included: Thomas Benton from Missouri, for staying in the Democratic Party despite his opposition to extending slavery into the territories; Sam Houston from Texas, for opposing Texas' secession from the Union—for refusing to support this secession, Houston was later deposed as Governor—and Edmund Ross from Kansas, for voting for acquittal in the Andrew Johnson impeachment trial. As a result of Ross' vote, Johnson's presidency was saved and the stature of the office was preserved.

In this definitive book on political courage, each of the eight Senators profiled is today considered a "hero" for having done the right thing, not the popular thing.

They are heroes today for having filtered out the political noise of the chattering classes of their day.

They are heroes for having done what was in the best interest of the United States and not in their own political best interest.

They are heroes for doing what was necessary instead of simply doing what was easy.

Today, each of us faces our own "Profiles in Courage" moment. A clash of visions regarding America's future has brought us to this point.

One vision has America defeating al-Qaida and the forces of Islamic fascism.

The other vision has America surrendering in Iraq and allowing jihadist forces to determine Iraq's future, making America and the rest of the world less safe.

These competing visions must be reconciled by each individual Senator.

But let's understand exactly what the majority party is attempting to accomplish by hijacking this legislation. I could speak at length about the ample amounts of unrelated pork that have somehow found their way into this emergency supplemental. Those embarrassments continue to be addressed by my colleagues.

What I would like to do is spend a few minutes specifically discussing the misguided efforts of the other side to revise, or more accurately restrict, this Nation's policy in Iraq.

Democrats are once again attempting to constrain this Nation's Commander in Chief in the execution of his constitutional duties; this time by inserting language in the emergency supplemental that would limit the use of force in Iraq to certain congressionally preapproved ends.

It would also provide a date certain for the surrender of U.S. forces in Iraq. This language within the emergency supplemental unconstitutionally micromanages the conduct of the war from the floor of the U.S. Senate. It

does so by providing that Congress, and not the Commander in Chief, would determine just how our military is to be used. It inserts 535 "commanders in chief" into the decisionmaking process when it comes to the execution of military operations in Iraq.

This is not what our Founding Fathers intended.

This legislation, as it is currently written, directs the President to begin the surrender of our forces no later than October 1 of this year, and calls for all U.S. combat forces to be back in the United States 180 days after that.

As a matter of policy, even the bipartisan Baker-Hamilton Commission specifically considered and rejected setting a timetable for our withdrawal from Iraq.

But this current debate we are engaged in regarding the emergency supplemental affects more than politicians on Capitol Hill. It goes far beyond the political posturing taking place on Sunday talk shows. It is more than a mere power struggle between the Commander in Chief and a new majority in Congress asserting itself.

No, this debate directly affects the health and well being of our men and women in uniform; men and women that this Congress authorized the President to send to Iraq.

This is unconscionable.

Recently, the Readiness and Management Support Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee held a hearing on overseas basing issues. Witnesses represented the Department of Defense and the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

As the ranking member, I asked these witnesses about the impact that delaying enactment of the emergency supplemental would have on Department of Defense operations, particularly those associated with Iraq and Afghanistan.

I learned from them that the Army has already started to feel the financial squeeze of our failure to pass the emergency supplemental and has begun to limit certain functions.

They have had to curtail the training of Army Guard and Reserve units within the United States, thus reducing their readiness levels.

They have had to reprioritize predeployment training and eliminate anything that is not Iraq specific. No longer will units deploy to Iraq capable of handling the full spectrum of possible military scenarios.

The Army has begun reducing quality of life initiatives, including the routine upgrade of barracks and other facilities.

They have stopped the repair and maintenance of hundreds of tanks, Bradleys, and other vehicles necessary for deployment training.

The impact only gets worse with time.

If the emergency supplemental funding is not received by May 15—less than a month from now—the Army will undertake further actions.

These include:

- reducing the pace of equipment overhaul work at Army depots, which will worsen the equipment availability problems facing stateside units;

- curtailing training rotations for brigade combat teams scheduled for deployment to Iraq. This will also slow the arrival of more brigades which are needed to expand the Army's rotational pool and reduce stress on existing units.

This smaller rotational pool will result in the further extension of those currently deployed until their replacements are judged to be ready for deployment.

The Army would be forced to implement a civilian hiring freeze.

They would have to prohibit the execution of new contracts and service orders.

They would have to hold or cancel repair parts orders in the nondeployed Army, directly impacting the units' ability to deploy with mission capable equipment and fully trained soldiers.

I shudder to think of what additional steps the military will need to take if Democrats remain as stubborn and irresponsible regarding the emergency supplemental as they have proven to be up to this point.

Before we consider voting on any emergency supplemental legislation which includes the offending surrender language, we need to seriously ask ourselves: in 20, or 50, or even 100 years, will those generations that follow us look upon us as the heroes of our time for having done the courageous thing?

Will we be admired for having chosen to do what was in the best interest of the Nation, in the best interest of the world, regardless of the political costs?

Or will this body be viewed with disdain for having cast our vote to set certain a date for our surrender to the forces of al-Qaida?

Will we be viewed as inhumane for condemning some 25 million Iraqis to a living hell on earth?

It is my opinion that this misguided effort by my Democratic colleagues is a surrender strategy for Iraq; a surrender that will take us at least a year to complete, but a surrender strategy nonetheless.

I join today with the President in refusing to surrender to the likes of al-Qaida.

Calling this surrender a "withdrawal," or a "redeployment," is like putting lipstick on a pig. No matter what you call it, it is still a pig. And no matter what you call this surrender, it is still a "surrender".

Now, there might have been a time in our history when we could have hidden behind our own borders and not had to worry about what was happening in the Middle East or any place else across the ocean. Those days haven't existed for some time.

Remember the consequences of our abandonment of Afghanistan in the 1980s. We supported the Mujahedin against the Soviets until the Soviets surrendered, or "withdrew" as my Democratic friends would call it, in

1989. Then we left the Afghans to fend for themselves. In short order, they had a civil war. The Taliban rose to power and provided a safe haven for al-Qaida. Osama bin Laden established training camps where he trained some 20,000 terrorists in the late 1990s; graduates of those camps came here and killed 3,000 of our fellow citizens on 9/11.

Perhaps, at the end of the Cold War, it was difficult to imagine the impact of the U.S. leaving Afghanistan. The same cannot be said about leaving Iraq. We have to prevail in Iraq, and we can if we don't choose to surrender.

In closing, I have a question for those on the other side.

If my Democratic colleagues believe our current struggle against Islamic jihadists in Iraq is such a mistake; if you honestly believe that you were lied to or misled into initially supporting this war and that there is no useful purpose for continuing; if you believe that the lives of those in uniform who have made the ultimate sacrifice were truly wasted; if you believe that al-Qaida and the threat of Islamic fascism confronting America is merely something invented by a small band of neoconservatives, or; if Islamic fascism is simply an ideological movement that can be appeased and reasoned with; then why are you seeking to continue funding our fight in Iraq for even another day?

If you believe that Iraq is simply a mistake gone bad, then you should at least have the courage of your convictions and act accordingly. Vote to end the funding now.

Don't string along those putting their lives on the line for you to make some sort of weak political statement.

This may well be our "Profiles in Courage" moment. I implore you to do the right thing, not the currently popular thing. Support our men and women in uniform, and do it now.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time on the Republican side be allocated as the sheet I will send to the desk indicates, and I further ask that quorum calls be charged to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OBAMA). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

U.S. TROOP READINESS, VETERANS' HEALTH, AND IRAQ ACCOUNTABILITY ACT, 2007—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the conference report on H.R. 1591, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1591), "making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes," having met, have agreed that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment and the Senate agree to the same, signed by a majority of the conferees on the part of both Houses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the proceedings of the House in the RECORD of Tuesday, April 24, 2007.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

TAKE OUR DAUGHTERS AND SONS TO WORK DAY

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I would like to speak just for a few moments, not about the pending business, which I know is extremely important and that debate will go on throughout the day and perhaps over the next several days as we try to make decisions about supplemental spending for the Gulf of Mexico and the importance of the emergency that is still underway there, and as we try to debate the best way to find success in Iraq.

I wanted to take a moment to speak about another issue that is important today to many Americans. In fact, we are celebrating that day on Capitol Hill. It is called Take Our Daughters and Sons to Work Day.

I have been honored over the many years with my cochair, Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, who is on the floor of the Senate today, to cohost this event for the Senate. We have many colleagues and staff members who participate in bringing their children and grandchildren and friends and neighbors to the Capitol to work to see the work of the Senate and the Capitol—how it happens, who makes it happen, and the significance of it. These children come from all over our country and take this experience back to their classrooms and into their homes and neighborhoods and share with their friends throughout the year.

I thank Ms. Magazine for starting this. Over 35 million adults and children will participate today. So in skyscrapers all over America, and on farms out in our rural areas, in small businesses and restaurants and small little boutique hotels, and even in home offices, children will be working with their parents or with their grandparents understanding the value of work, understanding and exploring options for themselves as they grow, and trying to make choices about how they can contribute significantly to this economy and to being part of the world community.

So I am pleased today to be able to submit for the RECORD the names of 14 young ladies who are with me today. I am not going to take the time to read their names, but I will submit them for the RECORD. They are from New Orleans,

LA, and some from Manderville; some are from Washington, DC, friends of the family who are here; and others are from outlying areas such as Maryland and Virginia who have joined us today to be part of the Senate.

Already this morning some of these girls have participated in closing the gap with the Susan G. Komen Breast Cancer Foundation that met on Capitol Hill out on the west lawn of our Capitol this morning to talk about the great effort that is being made to address breast cancer, particularly in this country, and to not only find cures but to offer preventive measures to help women and families stay healthy in our country. They have already participated in a press conference and will be joining us later today as we work through our offices in and around the Senate complex.

I wanted to welcome them to the Senate. I will submit their names to be printed in the RECORD, and I encourage anyone in the Capitol complex, if you are not participating today, to think about next year and what you could do to contribute to make this day a special day for some child in either your family or in your community who could use an extra boost or some insight into a possible career for themselves.

I thank Senator REID for making the tour of the Senate possible today for the young girls and boys who got to spend some time on the floor earlier this morning, and I thank minority leader MITCH MCCONNELL for arranging the special tours for that as well.

Mr. President, I again thank Ms. Magazine for an extraordinary effort. I know the children enjoy getting a day off from school, but it is more than that, and I have enjoyed participating these many years.

I ask unanimous consent that the list to which I referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Morgan Daigle, 11, New Orleans, LA, St. Dominic.

Christine Evans, 10, Washington, DC, National Cathedral School.

Katherine Evans, 10, Washington, DC, National Cathedral School.

Charlotte Ganucheau, 13, Mandeville, LA, Our Lady of the Lake.

Sofia Gonzales, 13, New Orleans, LA, Metairie Park Country Day School.

Jamie Hauptmann, 11, Mandeville, LA, Lake Harbor, Middle.

Lena Jones, 12, Washington, DC, St. Peter's Inter-parish School Capitol Hill.

Gabrielle Kehoe, 11, New Orleans, LA, St. Pius X.

Kristen Landrieu, 12, New Orleans, LA, St. Dominic.

Natalie Mufson, 13, Washington, DC, Georgetown Day School.

Selin Odabas-Geldiay, 13, Washington, DC, Georgetown Day School.

Erica Sensenbrenner, 14, New Orleans, LA, Dominican High School.

Hannah Sensenbrenner, 12, New Orleans, LA, St. Dominic.

Eliza Matthews

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I yield the floor.